REMARKS

Claims 16-20 are added and claims 1-20 are now pending in the patent application.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

The claims are rejected as being obvious based on a prior art combination of Parasnis in view of Banerjee.

The rejection is respectfully traversed because the prior art combination does not teach or suggest assembling and displaying objects for editing by a user, where a plurality of objects of a slide to be displayed successively one after the other are assembled in a first column, and any and all objects to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column are assembled in a second column of the slide, and where the first and second column are displayed at the same time side-by-side in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when a multimedia presentation is played on a display device of a communication or computing terminal, as claimed. In effect, there is a claimed structural relationship between the plurality of objects assembled in the first column and the any and all objects assembled in the second column.

For example, Parasnis discloses a technique for recording a presentation for on-demand viewing over a computer network, where a browser window 1195 has a primary frame 1196 with a slide image 1198, and has a secondary frame 1197 with a visual image 1194, as shown in Figure 10. The reasoning in section 5 of the office action recognizes that Parasnis fails to disclose slides displayed in parallel for editing by a user. In effect, it is respectfully submitted that Parasnis does not disclose, teach or suggest assembling for editing by a user a plurality of objects of a slide to be displayed successively one after the other in a first column, and any and all objects to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-

side with any of the objects of the first column are assembled in a second column of the slide, as claimed. To make up for this fundamental deficiency, the reasoning in section 5 of the office action points to Banerjee.

However, Banerjee discloses a meta-slide technique for producing a multimedia presentation. Figure 1 shows 3D meta-slides i - 1, i and I +1. The 3D meta-slide i contains three rows of whiteboards (i, 1), (i, 2), (i, 3), where the first index refers to the meta-slide number and the second index refers to the whiteboard number. The whiteboard (i, 1) in the first row includes a slide sequence having a slide 1, …, j, j +1, …, m; the whiteboard (i, 2) in the second row includes a slide sequence having a slide …, k, k +1, …; and the whiteboard (i, 3) in the third row includes a slide sequence having a slide …, l, l +1, … . The slides in different rows have variable durations and may overlap, as shown in Figure 1, and as described in paragraphs 17-20, including paragraph 18. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that, similar to Parasnis, Banerjee does not disclose, teach or suggest assembling for editing by a user a plurality of objects of a slide to be displayed successively one after the other in a first column, and any and all objects to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column are assembled in a second column of the slide, as claimed. It is respectfully submitted that Banerjee does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed structural relationship between the plurality of objects assembled in the first column and the any and all objects assembled in the second column. For example, it is respectfully submitted that the slides in the different rows of whiteboards (i, 1), (i, 2), (i, 3) are not assembled or processed based on a relationship defined by a first column or a second column. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the slides in the different rows of whiteboards (i, 1), (i, 2), (i, 3) are not assembled or processed based on a relationship defined by first and second columns.

For all these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art combination does not disclosed, teach or suggest the subject matter recited in the independent claims.

The remaining claims depend from and contain all the limitations of the independent claims, and are believed patentable for all the same reasons. For example, Reams is not cited for, and does not make up for, the fundamental deficiency of the prior art combination of Parasnis in view of Banerjee.

Claims 16-20 are added to recited other features of the present invention described in the patent application, on page 11, first paragraph.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and early allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

_____21 July 2009_____ .	/William J. BARBER/
Date	William J. Barber
	Attorney for the Applicant
	Registration No. 32,720
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS	
& ADOLPHSON LLP	tel: (203) 261-1234
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224	Cust. No.: 004955
Monroe, CT 06468-0224	